R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 022 UD 002 468

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHER TRAINING FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN SPECIAL CLASSES (CAREER GUIDANCE) IN REGULAR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL.

BY- TANNENBAUM, ABRAHAM J.
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

PUB DATE 30 SEP 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$2.72 68P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, *TEACHER EDUCATION, *EVALUATION, *POTENTIAL DROPOUTS, DISADVANTAGED GROUPS, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, SUPERVISORS, INTERVIEWS, INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, PLANNING, *GUIDANCE, QUESTIONNAIRES, STATISTICAL DATA, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, STUDENT NEEDS, NEW YORK CITY, ESEA TITLE I PROJECT

TWO PROJECTS INITIATED BY THE NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION TO IMPROVE A CAREER GUIDANCE PROGRAM FOR EIGHTH- AND NINTH-GRADE STUDENTS WERE EVALUATED. NEW CURRICULUMS FOR THE CLASSES WERE CREATED AND FOUR TEACHER TRAINING SESSIONS ON THEIR USE WERE GIVEN. THE EVALUATORS ASSESSED THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE BOARD'S GOALS THROUGH QUESTIONNAIRES, INTERVIEWS, AND OBSERVATION, BUT WERE GREATLY HANDICAPPED BY THE UNAVAILABILITY OF THE CURRICULUM GUIDES, BY THE LESS THAN 40 PERCENT RESPONSE TO THE QUESTIONNAIRES, AND BY GREAT TIME PRESSURES. RECOMMENDATIONS WERE MADE THAT (1) THE INSERVICE TEACHING PROGRAM BE GIVEN AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR USING THE ACTUAL PROPOSED MATERIAL, (2) TEACHERS BE PREPARED IN VARIOUS SPECIALIZED SUBJECTS AND TRAINED BY THOSE INVOLVED IN PREPARING THE NEW CURRICULUMS, AND (3) MORE TIME BE GIVEN TO THE INSERVICE TRAINING. THE MATERIALS WHICH THE EVALUATORS EVENTUALLY SAW WERE NEITHER NEW NOR CONSISTENT WITH A CLEAR GOAL FOR CAREER GUIDANCE CLASS PUPILS NOR VALUABLE TO THE TEACHERS. IT WAS QUESTIONED WHETHER EITHER PHASE OF THE PROGRAM MERITED FEDERAL FUNDING. (NH)

ED011022

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, New York

Educational Practices Division
Nathan Brown, Associate Director

Evaluation of New York City School District educational projects funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) - performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1965-66 School Year.

Joseph Krevisky
Research Coordinator, Title I Projects

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHER TRAINING FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN SPECIAL CLASSES (CAREER GUIDANCE) IN REGULAR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD 002 468

Dr. Abraham Tannenbaum
Research Director

September 30, 1966

64p.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Project Design 1
The Features of this Program 1
The Plan of the Evaluation. 3
The June Teacher-Supervisor Training Program. 4
Objectives of the Training Program. 4
Objectives of the Evaluative Study. 4
Methodology Employed in the Evaluative Study. 5
Limitations of the Study. 7
Results 9
Implementation. 9
Analysis of the Reactionnaires. 12
Application. 23
Role Differentials 26
Research Team's Evaluation. 30
Curriculum Development 33
Objectives and Design of the Curriculum Writing Project. 33
Objectives of the Evaluative Study. 35
Methods of Obtaining Information 36
Results. 39
Implementation 40
Achieving the Objectives 41
Summary Conclusions and Recommendations. 52

Appendices

Project Design

Introduction: A Junior High School Career Guidance Program has been in operation since 1958 in order to reduce 9th grade potential dropouts and to provide these students with saleable and marketable skills. At the beginning six classes on the 7th, 8th and 9th grades were given a curriculum focused on the world of work. The program was expanded in 1960 and 1963 so that there were in 1965 about 2300 children in 154 classes housed in more than 30 junior high schools, with the following class organization: 124 all boys, 19 all girls and 11 coeducational. The next sizable expansion of the program occurred in September, 1965 when a federal grant permitted the introduction of Career Guidance Classes into middle schools where the 8th grade is the terminal year. While 14 became the minimum age for the 8th grade group, the basic philosophy and pattern of the program remained the same. During this past year, there were 1,395 9th graders and 1,045 8th graders in the Career Guidance Program. Some of the features of the program follow:

a) The 9th year, which constitutes the probable "terminal" year, was set as the desirable arena for this total educational assault against dropping out.

b) Students had to be at least 15 years old. Since the student was over-age and had certainly experienced academic failure, he represented a likely candidate for dropping out.

c) Hopeless discipline or attendance problems were not to be considered for the program. The youngsters being sought were those who had met failure and frustration, but nonetheless showed signs of motivation and potential academic success.

d) Classes were limited to a maximum register of 15 and a full-time advisor was assigned to each core of three classes. In addition, each unit

of 45 students was provided with a full-time Industrial Arts teacher. Each class met for 8 full periods a week with the Industrial Arts teacher, making the shop the main setting of the program.

e) Two full-time Job Placement Supervisors were engaged to find part-time jobs for the pupils and to train the guidance advisors in the techniques of job canvassing and follow-up activities.

This report deals with two related programs initiated by the Board of Education of New York City to further develop this program. The first was a program of teacher-training sessions related to the implementation of a new curriculum, the second was the process of writing a new or revised curriculum. The proposal under study was submitted in April, 1966 and the completion date for the printing of the new curriculums was set for September, 1966. To be ready for distribution and use for the fall semester, the September completion date was necessary. Regarding the curriculum aspect of the program, the Coordinator, Mrs. Gida Cavicchia, wrote in September, 1963:

> In addition to the basic skills, the pupil in a Career Guidance Class needs a functional and realistic course of study based on his needs and interests, and not a "watered-down" version of the curriculum at which he has already failed so many times before.
>
> A team of subject area specialists has prepared experimental courses of study for these classes in social studies, mathematics, science, language arts, group guidance and job placement, based on personal observations in the classroom, consultations with principals, assistant principals, Career Guidance teachers, Career Guidance advisors and pupils. These courses are currently being used. In addition, we are preparing Courses of Study in Home Economics, Office Practice and Typewriting.

At the time of her report, six experimental curriculum reports had been completed and a seventh, Speech, was printed. It is these experimental editions that remained in use until the request for federal funds to develop a new curriculum.

Plan of Evaluation

Several points ought to be made clear at the outset. First, this evaluation which was concentrated in the month of June, 1966, was not concerned with the total Career Guidance Program, although some interviews took place at a later date. To soak up orientation and maintain perspective, it was necessary for the evaluating team to be familiar with all facets of the program, but it is only one aspect of the total field - curriculum development - that remains the central focus of this evaluation. Second, the nature of the evaluation was shaped by the unfortunate unavailability in June 1966 of one major segment of the proposal, the new curriculums. There was no possibility of critical comparison with the current curriculums and no opportunity for experimental manipulation of variables. Third, the total time allotted for the design and execution of this evaluation was about three weeks, which limited the depth and complexity of the study.

The proposed evaluation falls readily into two fairly distinct halves: the June training sessions and the curriculum development. For the sake of clarity this report will first deal with the two separate entities and then reserve integrative efforts for the final section on overall recommendations. Following is the outline:

Part A: The June Training Sessions

1. Statement of the proposal.
2. Purposes of the sessions.
3. Objectives of the evaluation.
4. Methods of obtaining information.
5. Results and conclusions.
6. Suggestions.

Part A : The June Teacher-Supervisor Training Program

I. OBJECTIVES OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM

The Teacher-Supervisor Training Program, which was arranged in June, 1966 for the teachers, advisors, and assistant principals in the Career Guidance Program, is closely linked to the projected new curriculum for the academically frustrated and economically disadvantaged youngsters of Career Guidance. The overall objective of the project was,

> To train teacher-supervisor personnel for the effective implementation of this new curriculum.

To implement this new curriculum effectively, it was proposed by the Board that all personnel attached to Career Guidance, comprising 228 teachers, 57 advisors, and 57 assistant principals, be trained and oriented to this new curriculum.

Four training centers were set up in 4 junior high schools centrally located in Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn and Queens to service the teachers and supervisors of each borough. The plan states that "Orientation and training will be given in Language Arts, Speech, Guidance, Mathematics, Social Studies, Industrial Arts, and Office Practice by teachers and Assistant Principals who helped design and create the curriculum in each of these areas."

The assistant principals who supervise the Career Guidance Program in each school were invited to attend all four sessions. Teachers were invited to attend only those sessions offering training in each of the subject areas they teach. Advisors were invited to attend the day that Guidance was offered.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATIVE STUDY

The objectives of the evaluative study by the Center for Urban Education were (1) to determine whether or nor the Board of Education carried out the Teacher-Supervisor Training Program for Career Guidance Personnel as described

in their project proposal's Curriculum Development and Teacher Training For Disadvantaged Pupils in Special Classes (Career Guidance) in Regular Junior High Schools. (2) To discover whether the Board of Education personnel met their stated objectives for the Teacher-Supervisor Training Program successfully and (3) To provide some guidelines and recommendations to the Board of Education regarding the direction that Teacher-Supervisor Training Programs might take in the future.

III. METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED IN THE EVALUATIVE STUDY

The data-gathering methods employed by the research team of the Center for Urban Education consisted of the following:

School visitation. In order to gain familiarity with the Career Guidance Program, its administrative structure, pattern of operation, and exposure to teacher-student interaction, a series of visits were made to various schools. Members of the research team spoke with principals, teachers, advisors, and assistant principals.

Interviews with the Director of Career Guidance. The director of the program was interviewed at length to elicit the underlying purpose of the training sessions, to supply background data concerning the trainers, and to explain the rationale for the manner in which the training sessions were given.

Interviews with the curriculum writers. Some of the trainers were interviewed by two members of the research team. Although the proposal stated that "..training will be given...by teachers...who helped design and create the curriculum..," this was not so in every case. Hence, only those trainers who were responsible for the writing of the curriculum were interviewed. Inter-judge reliability was sought regarding the trainers' percepts of several aspects of the new curriculum, such as:

a) What are the important projected outcomes of Career Guidance?

b) Is the new curriculum a revision of the standard course of study or totally new?

c) Is the new curriculum highly structured in a "cookbook" style or does it allow for flexible application?

d) To what extent is the June Training Program vital to the success of Career Guidance?

In addition to the concurrent percepts of two interviewers, these sessions were tape recorded to permit follow-up analysis by the full research team.

Observations of the Training Sessions. A member of the research team visited four training sessions. The observer took copious notes of the sessions, spoke with many of the trainees and most of the trainers, and wrote a general description of the sessions including personal impressions and evaluations. Four of the sessions, speech, mathematics, social studies, and science, were tape recorded to permit analysis by the entire research team. The materials which were distributed at the sessions, such as outlines, lesson plans, and parts of the curriculum, were collected by the observer and studied by the research team.

Examination of attendance records. To determine if all Career Guidance personnel attended the sessions, the attendance records were examined at the Bureau of Curriculum Research. The attendance records were analyzed for (1) The number of Saturdays attended by the eligible trainees, and (2) The number of assistant principals and advisors in attendance at the program whose names were listed in the Career Guidance Directory 1965-1966. (see appendix)

The Reactionnaire. A reactionnaire was developed by the research team to elicit the trainees' evaluation of the sessions. Part I of the instrument gathered such background information about trainees as position and number of years in the New York City system, the license or licenses currently held, subjects taught in city system and subjects currently taught

Part II of the reactionnaire was designed for the following:

a) Overall perspective: How did the trainees regard the idea of expending federal funds for the June In-Service sessions as planned?

b) Perspective of target population: Did the trainees expect Career Guidance pupils to benefit from their training experiences?

c) Contrast analysis: Degree to which trainees expected to benefit before the sessions; post session assessment; and comparison of the pre- and post-session ratings.

d) Teacher effectiveness: Ratings of each instructor's coverage of content, his organization of subject matter, the quality of his presentation, and his mastery of the subject.

e) Application: Whether assistant principals, teachers, and advisors feel that their own professional behavior will change as a result of the June sessions.

f) Role differentials: Each of the three groups rating the chances for professional change of the other two groups.

In Part III, trainees were requested to write freely about any aspect of the session attended or program in general that pleased and/or displeased them. Suggestions for improvement of the Teacher-supervisory Training Program for Career Guidance were also solicited.

Limitations of the Study. The single most serious limitation of this evaluation was the unavailability of the new curriculum. The very purpose of the training sessions was to "train teachers...for the effective implementation of this new curriculum." However, interviews with curriculum writers revealed that in most cases, the new curriculum was not yet complete at the time of the June sessions. This was true for Industrial Arts, Science, parts of Office Practice, Social Studies, and Language Arts.

The guidance curriculum was complete but was not made available to the research team for study. The Mathematics curriculum was complete but in the process of revision. Only the Speech curriculum was ready for examination.

Inability to obtain accurate background data was another constraining element. It was not possible to ascertain exactly the respective number of teachers, advisers, and assistant principals present at the sessions. A list of trainees was available, but there was no breakdown of the list according to school position held. Unfortunately, this difficulty was not anticipated by the research team. It was therefore not possible to determine accurately if the training program reached those Career Guidance personnel for whom it was intended in terms of position and content area taught in the Career Guidance Program.

Furthermore, it was not possible to determine the extent to which the training program reached <u>all</u> of the personnel who will be involved in the program in September, 1966. Some of the trainees in attendance may not, for various reasons, be available for the program in September. In addition, not all personnel who will be in the program have been so designated, leaving a number of later appointees who will not have benefitted from the training sessions.

Another limiting factor was the small number of reactionnaires that were returned. Although the proposal stated,

> "The teacher training aspect of the program will be investigated by the use of questionnaires designed to elicit both positive and negative aspects of the teacher training program which will be used for future development in this area."

the Director of the Career Guidance Program asked that no time be taken at the training sessions to complete the reactionnaires. It was, therefore, necessary that the trainees mail the reactionnaires to the Center for Urban Education.

The fact that less than 40 percent of the trainees returned the reactionnaires is related to this refusal to allot time at the sessions. Moreover, both the quality of the ratings and the accuracy of the reported percepts may suffer when the heat of immediate reaction is lost.

Finally, the time allocated for the evaluation, but one month, and the fact that the data had to be collected during the month of June, the busiest time of the school year, added impediments for the research team and the school personnel. School visitations could not always be warmly received, Career Guidance personnel could not always be available for interviews, and some of the curriculum writers could only be seen but fleetingly. Also, a more extensive time period would have permitted use of other assessment devices (such as the Oscar 3D Scale) and opportunities for depth interviews of teachers, assistant principals, and advisors attached to Career Guidance.

IV. RESULTS

There were three objectives of the evaluation: to determine whether the Board's personnel carried out the proposal; to determine whether they met their objectives successfully; and to offer guidelines for the future. The results pertaining to these objectives will be reported in turn.

IMPLEMENTATION

The sessions were held on the four Saturday mornings in June as stated in the proposal. The procedures were carried out as planned, except that the stenographers were not present. Following is the schedule of the training sessions as held in the four boroughs:

SCHEDULE

SCHOOL	JUNE 4	JUNE 11	JUNE 18	JUNE 25
J 44M	Language Arts Guidance	Mathematics Speech	Social Studies Science	Industrial Arts Office Practice
J-133X	Industrial Arts Office Practice	Language Arts Guidance	Mathematics Speech	Social Studies Science
J-49 K	Social Studies Science	Industrial Arts Office Practice	Language Arts Guidance	Mathematics Speech
J-16 Q	Mathematics Speech	Social Studies Science Practice	Industrial Arts-Office	Language Arts Guidance

Attendance records revealed that of the 311 Career Guidance personnel eligible to attend, 273 (87.7 per cent) trainees were present at one or more sessions. However, it was difficult to determine the exact number of teachers, assistant principals, and advisors among the 273 attendees. In addition, some of the teachers present may have been appointed as advisors sometime after the training sessions and other administrative changes may have affected the number of assistant principals present.

Information regarding the background of the trainees was obtained from the returned reactionnaires. However, of the 816 reactionnaires distributed,(one reactionnaire per trainee for each session attended) but 316, or 38.7 percent were returned. Consequently, the data available were based on this small sample of the total trainee pool. In Table I are the background data for all three groups of participants. It may be noted that more than 2/3 of the teachers who returned the reactionnaire had taught 4 or more years. No single advisor had less than 4 years of teaching experience. Of the assistant principals who were supervising the Career Guidance Program, more than 94 percent had more than 11 years of teaching experience.

It appears that, as a group, the personnel attached to Career Guidance are generally experienced teachers.

A sample representing about half of the Career Guidance teachers present at the training sessions who returned reactionnaires indicated the following kinds and numbers of licenses held:

Social Studies	11
Industrial Arts	12
Common Branches	8
Social Studies Sub.	11
English Substitute	9
Science Substitute	6
English	4
Science	3
Mathematics	2

It seems that the typical Career Guidance teacher is generally licensed in some field, but it is also apparent from the reactionnaires that some subject areas are being taught by unlicensed teachers. For example, Mathematics seems to be often taught by those without licenses to teach Mathematics in Junior High Schools.

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND DATA FOR 136 TRAINEES IN THE TEACHER - SUPERVISOR TRAINING PROGRAM, JUNE, 1966

Years of Teaching Experience, NYC Public Schools	Teachers N	Teachers %	Advisors N	Advisors %	Assistant Principals N	Assistant Principals %	Total N	Total %
3 or less	30	34.5	0	00.0	0	00.0	30	22.1
4- 10	42	48.3	12	66.6	2	6.5	56	41.1
11- 20	12	13.8	3	16.7	23	74.2	38	28.0
21 or more	3	3.4	3	16.7	6	19.3	12	8.8
Totals	87	100.0	18	100.0	31	100.0	136	100.0

Years of Teaching Experience, NYC Public Schools	Teachers N	Teachers %	Advisors N	Advisors %	Assistant Principals N	Assistant Principals %	Total N	Total %
Sex								
Male	64	73.6	10	55.6	21	67.7	95	69.0
Female	22	25.3	8	44.4	10	32.3	40	30.0
No response	1	1.1	0	00.0	0	00.0	1	1.0
Totals	87	100.0	18	100.0	31	100.0	136	100.0

Analysis of the Reactionnaires

To determine whether the training sessions were successful, two sets of percepts will be reported. In this section, the trainees' responses to the reactionnaire will be analyzed according to the six types of data that the reactionnaire was designed to elicit. In the following section, the research team's own appraisal of the training sessions will be discussed.

Overall perspective. Although the trainees were probably aware of alternative ways of spending federal money, such as more personnel, equipment, textbooks, and materials, Table II indicates that all three participating groups regarded the expenditure of federal funds for the June training sessions as "good" to "excellent." No single mean score was below "4" which represented "good" on a five-point scale. An analysis of variance was done to find possible differences among the subgroups, teachers, advisors, and assistant principals, but the F ratio was not significant. Generally, then, the trainees agreed that the expenditure of funds for the training sessions was beneficial.

Target population. The teachers felt that Career Guidance pupils will benefit from these brief training experiences. No single mean score was below 3.58, with "3" representing the mid-point on a five-point scale (see Table III).

Also, from Table IIIa it is apparent that this feeling of value for the pupils was quite comparable across content areas.

TABLE II

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TEACHERS, ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS AND ADVISORS ABOUT BOARD'S DECISION (ITEM I ACROSS AREAS)

GROUP	N	M	SD
Teachers	87	4.04	1.37
Assistant Principals	31	4.15	.86
Advisors	17	4.74	.56

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F P > .05
Between Groups	6.848	2	3.424	2.384 P>.05
Within groups	189.567	132	1.436	
Total	196.415	134		

Note: The means of the 3 groups are above 4, e.g. good.

TABLE III

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF BENEFITS FOR GUIDANCE PUPILS IN 8 AREAS (ITEM 10 RATED BY TEACHERS).

AREA	N	M	SD
Guidance	19	4.00	1.33
Industrial Arts	21	4.10	1.22
Language Arts	18	4.06	1.11
Math	22	3.86	1.42
Office Practice	24	4.25	1.03
Social Studies	25	3.60	1.26
Science	24	3.58	1.47
Speech	22	3.91	1.15

TABLE IIIa

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
Between Areas	9.04	7	1.292	.812 n.s.
Within Areas	265.496	167	1.590	
Total	274.536	174		

Contrast Analysis. From Tables IV and V it is evident that, by and large, both pre-session expectations and post-session assessments for teachers exceeded a "satisfactory" rating. In only one content area - Speech - did the post-session rating for teachers reach as high as "4" which represented "good." Generally, the degree to which teachers expected to benefit before the sessions and their overall rating after the sessions was moderately high. Two analyses of variance were done to find possible differences among teachers in the eight content areas for pre-session expectations and post-session assessments, but neither F ratio was significant.

Table VI contrasts the pre-session expectations and post-session assessments for teachers of eight content areas. Generally, the pattern revealed assessments higher than expectations. In only one instance, Speech, did the participating teachers feel that they had derived significantly more from the training session than they had initially expected. In only two cases were expectations not fulfilled: Mathematics and Social Studies, but in neither case was the differential assessment significant. The teachers entered the sessions with moderately high expectations and were rewarded with slightly more than fulfillment for these positive expectations.

TABLE IV

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS IN 8 AREAS (ITEM 3)

AREA	N	M	SD
Guidance	22	3.36	1.18
Industrial Arts	23	3.17	1.27
Language Arts	16	3.56	1.32
Math	25	3.88	.97
Office Practice	24	3.46	1.25
Social Studies	23	3.30	1.40
Science	26	3.27	1.37
Speech	22	3.36	1.09

TABLE IVa

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
Between Areas	8.081	7	1.154	.757 n.s.
Within Areas	264.007	173	1.526	
Total	272.088	180		

TABLE V

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TEACHERS' ASSESSMENTS IN 8 AREAS (ITEM 4)

AREA	N	M	SD
Guidance	22	3.68	1.29
Industrial Arts	23	3.39	1.50
Language Arts	16	3.94	1.24
Math.	25	3.48	1.42
Office Practice	24	3.88	1.04
Social Studies	23	3.17	1.30
Science	26	3.46	1.36
Speech	22	4.18	1.33

TABLE Va

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
Between Areas	17.251	7	2.464	1.427 P> .05
Within Areas	298.683	173	1.726	
Total	315.934	180		

TABLE VI

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EXPECTATIONS AND ASSESSMENTS OF 8 AREAS, FOR TEACHERS (ITEMS 3 & 4)

AREA	SITUATION	N	M	50	M diff.	df	t	P.
Guidance	Expectation	22	3.36	1.18	.32	21	.81	n.s.
	Assessment		3.68	1.29				
Industrial Arts	Expectation	23	3.17	1.27	.22	22	.62	n.s.
	Assessment		3.39	1.50				
Language Arts	Expectation	16	3.56	1.32	.38	15	1.38	n.s.
	Assessment		3.94	1.24				
Math	Expectation	25	3.88	.97	.40	24	1.22	n.s.
	Assessment		3.48	1.42				
Office Practice	Expectation		3.46	1.25				
	Assessment	24	3.88	1.04	.42	23	1.55	n.s.
Social Studies	Expectation	23	3.30	1.40	.10	22	.36	n.s.
	Assessment		3.17	1.30				
Science	Expectation	26	3.27	1.37	.19	25	.55	n.s.
	Assessment		3.46	1.36				
Speech	Expectation	22	3.36	1.09	.82	21	2.88	.01
	Assessment		4.18	1.33				

Tables VII and VIII report the same data for the assistant principals, pre-session expectations and post-session assessments. (There were too few returns from the advisors to do any statistical analysis.) For the assistant principals, as with the teachers, the ratings generally exceeded the "satisfactory" level. No single expectation or post-session assessment was below "3," the mid-point on the five-point scale. Two of the expectations and four of the assessments were at or above the rating of "good." An analysis of variance, done to find possible differences among assistant principals' pre-session expectations in the eight content areas, revealed an insignificant F ratio. However, the F ratio of an analysis of variance of assistant principals' post-session assessments in the eight content areas indicated significance. The Scheffe test was used to test the difference between individual means, but none reached significance at the .05 level.

Table IX contrasts the expectations and assessments of assistant principals for the eight content areas. Post-session assessments were significantly higher in two content areas - Speech and Language Arts. Although no single comparison was significant, assistant principals got less than expected from four sessions: Guidance, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. Nonetheless, each of these assessments remained moderately high.

TABLE VII
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS' EXPECTATIONS IN 8 AREAS (ITEM 3)

AREA	N	M	SD
Guidance	9	4.11	.60
Industrial Arts	14	3.57	1.22
Language Arts	9	3.67	.87
Math	14	3.57	1.16
Office Practice	14	3.71	1.07
Social Studies	12	3.50	.90
Science	11	4.00	.78
Speech	13	3.08	1.32

TABLE VIIa

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
Between Areas	7.974	7	1.139	1.038 P .05
Within Areas	96.526	88	1.097	
Total	104.500	95		-

TABLE VIII
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS' ASSESSMENTS IN 8 AREAS (Item 4)

AREA	N	M	SD
Guidance	9	4.00	1.18
Industrial Arts	14	3.57	1.16
Language Arts	9	4.78	.44
Math	14	3.29	1.20
Office Practice	14	4.07	.73
Social Studies	12	3.33	1.23
Science	11	3.45	1.04
Speech	13	4.46	.78

TABLE VIIIa
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
Between Areas	23.939	7	3.420	3.366 P<.005
Within Areas	89.394	88	1.016	
Total	113.333	95		

TABLE IX

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EXPECTATIONS AND ASSESSMENTS OF 8 AREAS FOR ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS (ITEMS 3 & 4)

AREA	SITUATION	N	M	SD	M diff.	df	t	P.
Guidance	Expectation Assessment	9	4.11 4.00	.60 1.18	.11	8	.36	n.s.
Industrial Arts	Expectation Assessment	14	3.57 3.57	1.22 1.16	.00	13	-	-
Math	Expectation Assessment	14	3.57	1.16	.28	13	.57	n.s.
Office Practice	Expectation Assessment	14	3.71 4.07	1.07 .73	.36	13	1.24	n.s.
Science	Expectation Assessment	11	4.00 3.45	.78 1.04	.54	10	1.60	n.s.
Social Studies	Expectation Assessment	12	3.50 3.33	.90 1.23	.17	11	.37	n.s.
Speech	Expectation Assessment	13	3.08 4.46	1.32 .78	1.38	12	3.6	< .005
Language Arts	Expectation Assessment	9	3.67 4.78	.87 .44	1.11	8	3.59	< .005

The small number of returns make conclusions regarding expectations and assessments somewhat speculative. In no case did more than 14 assistant principals respond, and the number of teachers did not exceed 26 for any single content area. Nevertheless, it appears that the assistant principals entered the sessions in a more hopeful manner and felt they were generally rewarded more. In only one content area did the teachers' rating exceed "4", while for the assistant principals six of the eight ratings were above "4". Also, it seemed easier to satisfy the assistant principals, for two content areas (Speech and Language Arts) showed significant increase between expectations and assessments, while for teachers, only one, Speech, showed significant increase.

Teacher effectiveness. Table X reports the teachers' ratings of the eight trainers. Four aspects of the trainers' effectiveness were included in the ratings: the instructor's coverage of content; his organization of subject matter; the quality of his presentation; and mastery of his subject. Apparently, the participating trainees were generally impressed with the presentations of the instructors and the content of their training sessions. No single mean rating was below the "satisfactory" point, ("3") and two of the sessions, Speech and Language Arts, were rated above "good".

Analysis of variance revealed a highly significant F ratio, which indicates a wide range of reaction to instructor effectiveness. The Scheffé test was used to test the difference between individual means and the only two that were significantly different from each other were Speech and Social Studies. It seems therefore, that all instructors were rated higher than "satisfactory", the level of ratings was not uniform for all content areas.

TABLE X

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RATINGS OF TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS IN 8 AREAS (TEACHERS' RATINGS ITEMS 5-8)

AREA	N	M	SD
Guidance	23	3.86	1.11
Industrial Arts	24	3.71	1.09
Language Arts	17	4.29	.85
Math	25	3.89	1.13
Office Practice	24	3.86	.92
Social Studies	28	3.36	1.09
Science	27	3.74	.90
Speech	22	4.60	.49

TABLE Xa

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F	
Between groups	23.53	7	3.361	3.35	P < .005
Within groups	182.34	182	1.002		
Total	205.87	189			

Application. Table XI reports the teachers' percepts regarding the chances that the training sessions will change their own professional behavior, as well as the chances that the professional behavior of assistant principals and advisors may be changed. With all three means between "3" and "4", the teachers felt that the chances were from "satisfactory" to "good" that the professional behavior of all three participating groups will be changed. An analysis of variance was done to find possible differences among the teachers' ratings of the three groups and a highly significant F ratio was obtained. The Scheffe' test was used and all means were found to be significantly different from each other. The teachers regarded themselves as most likely to change and the assistant principals as least susceptible to change.

Table XII reports the assistant principals' percepts of change as a result of the training sessions for themselves, teachers, and advisors. Although the F ratio derived from an analysis of variance did not reach significance, the assistant principals also perceived the teachers' chances of change higher than their own or than the advisors' chances for professional change. In table XIII are the same percepts for the three participating categories by the advisers. The Scheffe' test was used and the means for both advisers and teachers were significantly higher than for the assistant principals. All three groups agreed

that the assistant principals stood to change least as a result of the training sessions.

TABLE XI

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PERCEIVED CHANGE IN PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR OF 3 CATEGORIES. ITEM 9 (a,b,c) FOR TEACHERS

CATEGORY	N	M	SD
Assistant Principals	82	3.13	1.22
Teachers	82	3.66	1.15
Advisors	82	3.44	1.14

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
SUMMARY TABLE XIa

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
Between Categories	11.629	2	5.815	15.138 (P $<$ .001)
Between Subjects	269.942	81	3.333	
Residual	62.224	162	.384	
Total	343.795	245		

TABLE XII

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PERCEIVED CHANGE IN PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR OF 3 CATEGORIES. ITEM 9 (a,b,c) FOR ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

CATEGORY	N	M	SD
Assistant Principals	28	3.86	.90
Teachers	28	4.00	.78
Advisors	28	3.90	.81

XIIa

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
Between Categories	.305	2	.152	1.816 (n.s.)
Between Subjects	51.181	27	1.896	
Residual	4.535	54	.084	
TOTAL	56.021	83		

TABLE XIII

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PERCEIVED CHANGE IN PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR OF 3 CATEGORIES. ITEM 9 (a,b,c) FOR ADVISORS

CATEGORY	N	M	SD
Assistant Principals	18	3.88	.89
Teachers	18	4.28	.84
Advisors	18	4.28	.84

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE XIIIa

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
Between Categories	1.920	2	.960	8.50(P<.01)
Between Subjects	33.853	17	1.991	
Residual	3.840	34	.113	
Total	39.613	53		

One may speculate regarding the consistently lower ratings of the assistant principals' chances for change. One possibility is that teachers view those in a status position above their own, including advisors and assistant principals, as more rigid and less likely to profit from a new training experience. If this interpretation is correct, then more or other kinds of training sessions may be required to overcome this perceived lack of change on the part of those in the upper reaches of the status hierarchy. Another possible interpretation, is that the teachers perceived the sessions as inappropriate for the assistant principals and as more relevant for teachers than for advisers. From this viewpoint, they were joined by the advisers who also felt that the assistant principals were misplaced at these training sessions. It must be underscored, though, that the assistant principals' chances for change were rated as above "satisfactory" by both teachers and advisers. The sessions were seen as more appropriate for teachers, rather than markedly inappropriate for assistant principals.

Role differentials. One final treatment of the data concerned differences between teachers', assistant principals', and advisers' perception of change in a professional behavior of each category of trainees. Regarding teachers' chances for change, Table XV indicates that all three groups of trainees felt their chances were from "satisfactory" to "good". An analysis of variance was done to

find possible differences among the three subgroups percepts of the teachers, but the F ratio was not significant. Although all felt that the teachers' chances for change were moderately high, the teachers took the dimmest view of the likelihood that the training sessions would change their professional behavior.

Table XV reports the percepts of the three training groups regarding the chances for change of the assistant principals. All three ratings were between "satisfactory" and"good". An analysis of variance yielded a highly significant F ratio and the Scheffe' test resulted in significant mean differences between advisors and teachers and between assistant principals and teachers. The teachers apparently perceived the assistant principals' chances for change far less than did either the assistant principals themselves or the advisers.

The final analysis, reported in Table XVI concerns the chances for change among advisers as viewed by all three groups of trainees. Two of the ratings were between "satisfactory" and "good", while the third was between "good" and "excellent". An analysis of variance was done to find possible differences among the subgroups and the F ratio was highly significant. The Scheffe' test was used and the mean difference between advisers' and teachers' percept of change for advisors was significant.

TABLE XIV

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TEACHERS, ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS AND ADVISORS PERCEIVING CHANGE IN PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR OF TEACHERS (ITEM 9b)

GROUP	N	M	SD
Teachers	82	3.66	1.15
Assistant Principals	28	4.00	.78
Advisors	18	4.28	.84

TABLE XIVa

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
Between groups	6.37	2	3.365	3.05 P>.05
Within groups	137.86	125	1.103	
Total	144.59			

TABLE XV

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TEACHERS, ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS AND ADVISORS PERCEIVING CHANGE IN PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS(ITEM 9a).

GROUP	N	M	SD
Teachers	82	3.13	1.22
Assistant Principals	28	3.86	.90
Advisors	18	3.88	.89

TABLE XVa

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
Between groups	15.9	2	7.95	6.28 P<.005
Within groups	158.23	125	1.266	
Total	174.13	127		

USING the Scheffe' test the following mean differences are significant at the .05 level: (1) Advisors vs. Teachers. (2) Assistant Principals vs. Teachers.

TABLE XVI

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TEACHERS, ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS AND ADVISORS PERCEIVING CHANGE IN PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR OF ADVISORS (ITEM 9c)

GROUP	N	M	SD
Teachers	82	3.44	1.14
Assistant Principals	28	3.90	.81
Advisors	18	4.28	.84

TABLE XVIa

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE

SOURCE	SS	df	MS	F
Between groups	12.48	6.24	5.67	P < .005
Within groups	137.68	1.101		
Total	150.16			

Using the Scheffé test the mean difference between Advisors and Teachers is significant at the .05 level. It is apparent, then, that teachers and advisors did not view the advisors' chances for professional change as a result of the training sessions similarly. The teachers expected far less change from the advisors than did the advisors themselves.

Several overall themes emerge from this series of analyses. First, the trainees generally felt quite good about the expenditure of federal funds for the June training sessions. Second, all three categories of trainees felt that the Career Guidance students will benefit from the sessions. Third, the trainees generally felt that the instructors were "good". Fourth, in most cases the trainees

got as much or more out of the sessions than they initially expected. Fifth, all three groups of trainees felt the chances were high that the sessions would alter the professional behavior of the trainees. Finally, the one differential pattern noted was the feeling that the training sessions had the strongest impact on the teachers and the relatively least effect on the assistant principals.

Research team's evaluation

In contrast with the generally favorable reactions of the trainees, the research team was quite critical of the June training sessions. The in-service Program was faulted on several counts:

1. The purpose of the training sessions was "for the effective implementation of the new curriculum". However, the new curriculum was, in most cases, neither complete nor available for study. This weakness led the research team, as well as many of the trainees, to doubt the wisdom of having the training sessions before the new curriculums were ready. Indeed, one of the curriculum writers stated, "These training sessions in June are crazy. We should have it in September when the thing is finished and we can bring it to them."

Procedurally, too, it was felt that September sessions would have been more beneficial. Many of the trainees in June will likely be working outside Career Guidance as a result of personal and professional considerations. Also, many later appointees will not have had the benefit of the training sessions.

2. The proposal stated that the trainers were to be those "who helped design and create the curriculum in each of these areas". This clause was in line with the basic intent to transmit the new curriculum to the trainees. However, in several instances the leaders of the training sessions were not involved in the writing of the new curriculum. Indeed, in one case the trainer was not licensed in the area that he was training. One unfamiliar with the new curriculum

cannot train others in a content area in which he is untrained.

3. The research team had some doubts about the In-Service Program as planned -even if the new curriculum were ready. First, is it reasonable to expect that "training" may be accomplished in one hour and twenty minutes? For example, there were but two licensed Mathematics teachers among those who returned the reactionnaires, suggesting that most of the Career Guidance classes may not be taught by licensed Mathematics teachers. Yet, the trainer undertook to convey the "new Math" to these mathematically unsophisticated teachers in one session. The research team was doubtful about such optimism. Moreover, if the Board feels that an extensive background and license are necessary to prepare one for teaching Mathematics in the regular track, the same should hold true for Career Guidance.

The same problem arose in the area of Science. Although a substantial part of the new curriculum was available at the time of the training sessions, the Board chose to appoint a licensed Social Studies teacher to train the teachers in the new Science curriculum. If Career Guidance students are to be taught 9th grade Science, which in the regular junior high school is viewed as a way station along a closely articulated, sequential course of study, then one must question the wisdom of training unlicensed teachers by an unlicensed trainer -and all within one hour and twenty minutes.

4. One final set of percepts concerns the training schedule as it applied to the target group of trainees. Assuming that no more than a brief introduction to the new curriculum could be accomplished in the short period alloted, it is surprising that veteran Career Guidance teachers were invited to the sessions. They had previously been introduced to the program and the effective approach with Career Guidance students is something they have learned first hand. Furthermore, all eight content areas were given "equal time", even though some are far less circumscribed than others.

Procedurally, too, the research team questioned the advisability of having personnel attend a training session outside their area of concern. Could the time have been spent more profitably by devoting full morning sessions to one single area? Possibly, the Board could have spent all of the available funds for intensive training in several areas, rather than a sprinkling in many.

In all, then, the research team was considerably less enthusiastic than the teachers regarding the advisability of spending federal funds for the training sessions rather than on other projects designed to improve Career Guidance. There was also a feeling of doubt as to the effects that the training sessions will have on the trainees and, subsequently on the students. In addition, there were serious reservations regarding the attempt to train personnel in a single all-too-brief session. Finally, the research team felt that training must be offered by highly trained instructors to school personnel equipped to teach in the content areas for which they will be responsible in September, 1966.

Part B: Curriculum Development

The project title refers to the target population as "academically frustrated and also severely disadvantaged economically and culturally." Linking the severe academic retardation to curricular inadequacies, the proposal asserts that the traditional curriculum had not met the needs of these potential dropouts. To combat this history of failure and defeat, curricular modification was advanced as a necessity:

> If these youngsters are to be rehabilitated and encouraged to continue their education in the one year they spend in these special classes a new and vital curriculum is essential in every subject area . . .based on their backgrounds, aspirations and culture, which will challenge them by utilizing their present interests and future hopes for the world of work. . . .All subject matter will concentrate less on theory and more on the functional and manipulative aspects of each subjects area in order to present pupils with true-to-life problems and situations. . .it is imperative that a curriculum be designed which will offer them a program of intensive corrective work, challenging subject matter, achievable goals, training in saleable skills and reconstruction of attitudes.

I. Objectives and Design of the Curriculum Writing Project

This aspect of the proposal contained two basic objectives:

a) To write a new and appropriate program of instruction for those who lack positive orientation toward school and are not succeeding.

b) "To involve teachers, supervisors and other resource personnel in developing this curriculum; thus training a nucleus of resource personnel for further work in curriculum and for orientation of new teachers."

To insure implementation of these objectives, a total revision of eight different curriculums was proposed and definite guidelines were issued to each of the writing teams. Among the specific instructions issued were the following:

1. Guidance

"The curriculum should be redesigned to include not only guidance in personal and social areas but also training in pre-vocational and vocational skills in preparation for the world of work. This curriculum will aid pupils to evaluate their capabilities and to guide them in planning ways of achieving their goals through success in pre-vocational and academic areas. It will include training in methods of locating part-time employment, preparation for obtaining employment, and follow-up guidance for pupils who obtain part-time jobs."

2. Language Arts

"Intensive corrective work in reading will be offered and extensive reading for information and appreciation in every subject area will be planned through work with newspapers, trade magazines and trade books."

"Basic skills (spelling, punctuation, grammar) will be taught functionally through familiar situations involving social amenities, job orientation, newspaper work, etc."

3. Mathematics

"The curriculum will be redesigned to offer instruction in corrective mathematics."

"Skills and knowledges needed for the recognizing and handling of the quantitative aspects in practical problem situations will be developed. The pupils will be led to realize that mathematics is an indispensable tool in daily living. Fundamental concepts and processes will be reinforced by application, according to ability, in the field of work and recreation."

"Instruction in Business Mathematics will be included to prepare the pupils for work with office machines; e.g., comptometers, computors, adding machines, cash registers."

4. Science

"The curriculum will be redesigned to provide the pupils with functional information and skills through as many manipulative experiences as possible with a minimum of theory and involved explanations. This course will provide the pupils with an understanding of some of the basic concepts of scientific achievement, first-hand experiences through work with science materials and equipment, a knowledge of the consumer's aspect of science, an awareness of the vocational aspect of science, and an awareness of some of the problems of our times relating to scientific achievement."

5. Social Studies

"The curriculum will be redesigned to include instruction in...consumer education and industry....Problems-centered units of work based on pupils' interests and experience will be used to motivate critical-thinking, oral discussion and research."

6. Industrial Arts

"The curriculum will be redesigned to afford the pupils an opportunity for occupational exploration. Major emphasis will be placed on instruction and opportunities for manipulative experiences organized in a cluster of instructional units related to the basic and machine processes essential in various industrial areas: Mass Production, Power Mechanics, Furniture Repair and Refinishing, Office Machines, and Building Maintenance."

"This curriculum will develop saleable skills to prepare these youngsters for a useful job in the world of work. Instruction will also be included to prepare them with methods for locating and holding part-time jobs."

7. Office Practice

"A new curriculum will be developed to offer these pupils an opportunity to learn Filing, Mailing, Messenger Service, Telephone Service, and Record Keeping to provide them with ready skills for obtaining part-time employment and to encourage them to continue their training in high school. This curriculum will also provide them with valuable training in avocational skills; e.g., good work habits, proper attitudes, dependability, honesty."

8. Speech

"The curriculum will be redesigned to offer training and practice in standard enunciation, articulation and voice training so necessary to developing self-respect and poise....Practical applications of the skills taught will be presented through role-playing in true-to-life situations;e.g., job interviews, shopping by telephone...."

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATIVE STUDY

Three limited objectives were formulated for this aspect of the report:

a) To determine whether the staff of the Board of Education carried out what it proposed to do. Were curriculum writers engaged? Were the procedures and guidelines set down in the proposal adhered to by the curriculum writers? For example, did the writers of the Science curriculum conform to the prescribed "minimum of theory and involved explanations?" Were teachers and supervisors involved in developing the new curriculum, as proposed by the

Board's project director ?

b) To determine whether the Board of Education achieved its stated objectives. The question here is whether the new curriculum is appropriate, whether it meets the needs of the target population.

c) To offer suggestions and recommendations on the basis of a critical review of the complete Career Guidance Program, the current curriculum, and the partial evidence available regarding the new curriculum. The objective here was to analyze the premises undergirding the proposal, to raise questions wherever appropriate, and to clarify the relevant issues. With the major component of the proposal, the new curriculum, as yet incomplete, the basic thrust of the evaluation was exploration and sharpening of focus.

III. METHODS OF OBTAINING INFORMATION

In this part of the study, observations and interviews had to be the basic evaluative tools. Two well-trained observers spent the month of June 1966 exploring and inspecting various aspects of the Career Guidance Program and the development of a new curriculum. Following were the specific steps taken:

School visitation. The two observers visited a total of 22 schools and spoke with principals, assistant principals, advisors, and teachers assigned to Career Guidance classes. In some cases they interviewed pupils, observed classes in progress, examined the available facilities, and studied the place of Career Guidance within the school structure. Orientation and familiarity were the goals of these visits.

Interviews with the Director of Career Guidance. Both observers met independently and jointly with the Director of the project. As the individual responsible for the proposal, the Director's understanding of the needs of Career Guidance [illegible]dents, the basic philosophy and purposes of the program,

the direction of the curriculum development, and the competence of the teachers were deemed essential to the evaluation.

Interviews with the Curriculum Writers. Each of the writers was interviewed to elicit their attitudes towards the curriculum, students, teachers, and total Career Guidance Program. A structured interview schedule was drawn up, a copy of which is appended. To permit interobserver reliability, six of the writers were interviewed by both observers. Each of the interviews was tape recorded to permit further analysis and assessment by the entire research team. In addition to information regarding credentials, qualifications, background, and methods of selection of the writers, answers were sought in each of the following questions:

a) Overall purpose of the program: Did the writers feel that the most important outcome of the Career Guidance Program was vocational skills, social adjustment, academic skills, or others?

b) The nature of the new curriculum: Did the writers view their ultimate product as a revision, extension, different in kind, different in quality, or other ?

c) Percept of teacher creativity: Are you providing clear-cut lesson plans or are you leaving room for teacher innovation?

d) Percept of student population: Does the curriculum resemble C.R.M.D., Academic, Business, Vocational and Trade, or other existing Board of Education curriculums ?

e) Similarity to the regular curriculum: Is the new curriculum a simplified version of the regular curriculum or one with a completely new focus ?

f) Perceived target population: Is the curriculum planned for both 8th graders and 9th graders, boys and girls, and all shades of ability and achievement?

g) Relative importance of the curriculum: How vital to the success of the total Career Guidance Program is the curriculum?

Suggestions from Writers and Others. The writers and those interviewed were encouraged to offer criticisms, suggestions, and evaluative comments. These assorted subjective appraisals provided a rich source of leads for further exploration.

Analysis of Current Curriculum. All curriculum materials in use to date in the Career Guidance Program were collected and examined critically for comparison with the anticipated curriculum as culled from the interviews with the curriculum writers. The two curriculums were scrutinized for differences and similarities regarding such issues as vocational vs. academic emphasis or rigid vs. flexible lesson plans.

Analysis of the Board's Evaluation. The Bureau of Educational Research of the Board of Education evaluated five selected schools in May, 1966. The three parts of their study touched on the total program, the behavior of the students, and achievement and attendance records.

In a questionnaire sent to the principals and Career Guidance Personnel of the five schools, each respondent was asked for his considered opinion of the Career Guidance Program. A copy of the questionnaire is appended. Opinions were sought regarding the following:

a) Describe the most effective aspects of the program.

b) Describe the least effective aspects of the program.

c) Describe the reactions of parents to the program.

d) Should the program be continued essentially unchanged, discontinued, or modified somewhat?

In addition, the teachers were requested to complete a "Student's School Attitude Scale" for each pupil in the Career Guidance Program. A copy of this

scale is also appended. The teachers rated each student on a 7-point scale, moving from "Highly motivated, No rebellion" to "Highly rebellious, no motivation." The teachers were to check one box for the best description of the student's behavior in September, 1965 and another for May, 1966.

Finally, a class sheet was completed for each group which contained Reading scores in October, 1965 and May, 1966; Mathematics scores for the same two dates; teachers' average mark for English, Social Studies, and Science for '64-'65 and '65-'66; and number of times late and absent for '64-'65 and '65-'66. The evaluative criteria were changes in behavior, achievement, and attendance.

Limitations of the Study: This evaluation was meant to assess the new curriculum, but the unavailability of the new curriculum placed a major obstacle in the path of this projected assessment. For example, it was not possible to compare the old curriculum with the new. Nor was it possible to design any analytic categories for an appraisal of the new curriculum. Consequently, this aspect of the report carries a more clinical and subjective stance. Writers' stated views of what they intended had to be substituted for exhaustive analysis of a finished product. Indirect bits of data were assembled, rather than immediate direct appraisal and critical review.

IV. RESULTS

For the sake of clarity, this diffuse body of data will be reported according to the objectives of the evaluation. Briefly stated, the objectives were to determine whether the proposal was implemented; whether the stated objectives were achieved; and to suggest guidelines for the future.

IMPLEMENTATION

Although many of the curriculum writers were still in the process of constructing their new curriculum at the time this part of the report was being written, it appears that the Board did carry out the basic steps of the proposal. Curriculum writers were engaged and the Board has been in the process of readying the materials for printing.

A question can be raised whether the curriculum writers adhered to the guidelines and procedures set up in the proposal. Comparison of statements in the proposal and views expressed by the curriculum writers suggests that the Board and the writers were not always in accord. For example, the proposal stated that the Language Arts curriculum "will be planned through work with newspapers, trade magazines and trade books." However, the writers of the Language Arts curriculum expressed no such intentions. Similarly, the proposal stated: "This curriculum (Industrial Arts) will develop saleable skills to prepare these youngsters for a useful job in the world of work." However, the writer of the Industrial Arts curriculum stated that he was not preparing Career Guidance students for a job, that the primary objective was to develop confidence and help the child's personality.

Another equivocal issue is whether the curriculum, as planned, is truly "new". Without considering the variety of applications of the terms, it is apparent that the Career Guidance curriculum has been under revision for some time. Of the three parts that comprise the new Social Studies curriculum, the first two parts were completed on 11/17/65 and 2/9/66. A complete revision of the Career Guidance Course of Study in Mathematics was printed on 8/28/64 and the writer of that curriculum was the same person who was to write the "new" curriculum. Indeed, the research team felt that most of the supposedly new curriculums were truly modifications, extensions, and revisions of existing Career Guidance Programs.

The second objective of the proposal was "to involve teachers, supervisors and other resource personnel in developing this curriculum." The purpose was to train a nucleus of resource personnel for further work in curriculum construction. However, in many cases the curriculum was written without soliciting suggestions from teachers and in many other instances the writers stated that their product requires no further work. Consequently, neither involvement nor ongoingness was noted as a general rule by the research team.

Achieving the Objectives

The previous section dealt with the relative externals of procedures, but with respect to objectives, one must be prepared to describe the nature of the students of Career Guidance, the professional preparation of the teachers in the program, and the long-range goals and purposes of the program. It is not wise to write a curriculum without a clear awareness of the three basic components of any curricular experience. The proposal states that the curriculum is designed "to meet the needs of..pupils..who are not succeeding." If the curriculum writers misjudge these needs or miscalculate the ability of the educational system to meet those needs, then their curriculum is most likely to be inappropriate.

Beginning with the understanding of the students' needs, the Director of the Career Guidance Program stated on several occasions that the students themselves have altered the direction of the program. Initially, the Director felt that a vocation-oriented, truncated version of the regular junior high school curriculum was appropriate. However, the students reportedly protested that they do not want to be shifted off to a vocational track and that they want to go on to college. The Director also reported remarkable achievement results on the part of Career Guidance students to justify return to the regular curriculum. The only difference envisaged was in approach, for the

Director felt that a "more jazzed-up approach" was necessary to cater to students who have experienced failure so often.

Many of the writers echoed the sentiments of the Director. Some saw no difference between the curriculum they were writing and the regular curriculum. Some suggested that their curriculum may, indeed, be substituted for the regular junior high school curriculum. The Industrial Arts writer also carefully avoided any vocational bent to the curriculum, insisting that the double dosage of shop is merely a means to improve academic skills through increased motivation and interest. It is worth noting here that more than 95 percent of the pupils go on to 10th grade instruction.

This optimistic view of the Career Guidance student was not borne out by assessments made by the Board.

Of 15 students in a Career Guidance class that was evaluated by the Bureau of Educational Research, 12 were reading below a grade level of 5.2 - after one year of Career Guidance. In the same group, 10 of the 15 had 17 or more absences during the school year. Such records hardly show promise of future academic success.

There is no desire to minimize the very real contribution that Career Guidance has made for many of these youngsters. Accolades were volunteered by assorted personnel regarding improved self image, increased ego strength, self acceptance, social conformity, and the like. But these unquestionably important services are not relevant to this particular proposal. The funds requested were for the construction of a curriculum that would meet the needs of Career Guidance students. Although there are some dramatic examples of sudden and marked academic growth in the period of one school year, most Career Guidance students remain severely retarded in the area of academic learning. The research team felt that the optimism inherent in Board's new

curricular stance runs counter to the reality view of research that longstanding cognitive and behavioral styles do not change quickly or radically. Consequently, regarding the all-important issue of the needs of Career Guidance students and the new curriculum being appropriate to those needs, the judgment of the research team was not congruent with that of the Board and the curriculum writers.

Parenthetically, many of the curriculum writers seemed aware of the dilemma; as one writer put it:

> Number one, we're trying to keep them in school. Number two, we're trying to give them a curriculum that would be meaningful to them in the immediate-when and if they should go out in the job market. These are incompatible. This is not the same kind of program that you'd be giving if you're preparing to kiss them goodbye at age 17.

Another teacher reported the instructions from the Board: Keep it as close as possible to the regular track 9th grade curriculum, but also keep it simple and stick to the basics. Although many of the curriculum writers recognized and verbalized the seeming paradox between job training and continuing in school, they generally proceeded to plan or create a curriculum that was equally suitable for any regular track.

The second component of this receiving system for the new curriculum is the teacher. Assorted probes were therefore meant to elicit the curriculum writers' judgment of the teachers in the Career Guidance Program. Generally, the writers viewed the teachers as inexperienced and in need of clear-cut lesson plans and a virtually cook-book curriculum. One writer explained:

> Much of curriculum planning is a matter of relieving teacher incompetence, of providing the marginal teacher with some wherewithal to function and to begin at least the teaching act.

Another writer stated:

> Once upon a time we thought it was terrible if teachers didn't prepare their own lesson plans. Now we think it's terrible if we don't prepare lessons for them.

Another writer stated that even a "blind" person could follow the specific instructions set down. One curriculum writer recognized that a highly structured curriculum leaves little room for teacher innovation:

> 90% of Career Guidance Language Arts teachers are not licensed in Language Arts. For them we must have clear-cut lesson plans. But those licensed would look with scorn and condescension. You're caught in a dilemma. Only direct way for unlicensed is consecutive lesson plans. For those licensed, just list skills in abstract.

The research team found the curriculum writers somewhat inflexible in their estimates of the target teachers for whom they were creating the new curriculum. There was little special provision for highly experienced and creative teachers; for those teaching boys' classes as against those teaching girls' classes; for 8th graders as against 9th graders; and for classes of considerably varying abilities and achievement levels. It appeared to the research team that the writers needed to take into greater account the broad variability in both teacher and student preparedness and the students' plans for continuing their education beyond the 9th year.

Several of the questions posed during the structured interviews were attempts to elicit the views of the curriculum writers regarding the overall purposes of the program and the relative importance of the curriculum within the hierarchy of special features that Career Guidance boasts. Regarding the single most important outcome of the program, the writers generally felt that a favorable ego image on the part of the pupils represented the single most vital product of Career Guidance. Although the writers were aware of other outcomes, such as academic skills or vocational preparedness, they chose the area of

personal adjustment as crucial. Nevertheless, the writers were unanimous in their feeling that an improved curriculum was vital to the success of the Career Guidance Program. They were fully aware of other aspects of the program, such as small classes; a full time advisor for 45 students; separate classes for boys and girls; a separate shop for Career Guidance; 8 periods a week of Industrial Arts; part-time work opportunities; and special funds for materials. Yet the writers viewed their product as playing a crucial part in the program.

Since the previous sections of this report were written before the completed new curriculums were reviewed, a supplementary report had to be added after the research team had the opportunity to study the completed curriculums. This addendum follows the same outline as used above: a) Implementation. b) Achievement of Objectives. c) Recommendations.

A. Implementation. An analysis of the completed curriculums underscores comments made above concerning the newness of the curriculum guides.

1. Both Social Studies I and Social Studies II are virtually identical copies of the experimental editions published 11/17/65 and 2/9/66. The changes that were made are minor, consisting of editorial and grammatical corrections and the addition of bibliographies.

2. Mathematics. The newly printed curriculum was substantially the same as the one printed on 8/28/64. Except for some changes of style, there were no changes or additions.

3. Speech. The initial experimental edition was printed on 6/28/63 and the new curriculum follows the same number and pattern of units.

4. Office Practice. The initial edition was printed in 1963, but some entirely new materials have been added since then.

5. Job Placement and Guidance. Although the new edition contains much that appeared in the 1963 edition, there are a sufficient number of entirely new and completely rewritten pages to justify designation as a new curriculum.

In general, then, it would have been more precise had the Board described the project as one involving several new curriculums and revisions of others.

B. Achieving the Objectives. Basically the earlier findings were reinforced after the new curriculums were studied. The key objective of the proposal was to create a curriculum that would meet the needs of chronic school failures. It is in this crucial area of defining the needs and potentialities of the target group where greater clarity is needed. For example, the introduction to the new Science curriculum states:

> Three years of experimentation and a study of similar programs throughout the nation showed that a new teaching approach was essential in every subject area, if these youngsters were to be rehabilitated and redirected. Adaptations or "watered-down" versions of the traditional curriculum without a modified approach presented learning situations which were only too familiar and were filled with the failures and frustrations of the past. It was also evident that once these pupils had spent some time in a Career Guidance class they began indicating that they no longer wanted to go to work; they now wanted to prepare themselves for high school.

Is it possible that some of the so-called chronic failures could after some exposure to the Career Guidance program be ready for the regular junior high school work?

The authors of the Science curriculum also state that theirs is a departure from the initial orientation of Career Guidance, that

they expect these youngsters to continue on into high school and not to enter the job market until further education.

> The subject matter developed departed largely from the job-centered themes and concentrated on the skills and subject matter necessary for further study in high school... The material presented parallels as closely as possible the regular 9th-Year Science curriculum.

Yet, the authors are not ready to say that their curriculum is identical with the regular one. Instead, their slant is to concentrate "less on theory and more on the functional and manipulative aspects... to present the pupils with true-to-life problems and situations." The same idea is repeated later: "Emphasis has been placed on providing the pupils with many experiences in the manipulation and use of science materials rather than on classroom discussions of theory..."

One wonders whether these pupils could transfer to an academic or vocational high school on the basis of manipulative activities that do not lead to the essential processes of abstracting, conceptualizing and critical analysis of printed material. Perhaps the most optimistic claim of the program was that the 9th grade students would be able to learn what they missed in the 7th and 8th grade science along with the regular 9th grade science curriculum. When the Director was asked how this can possibly be accomplished, the answer was that the classes are small and most of the students hold part-time jobs, thus permitting others to have virtually private instruction and to move rapidly.

Questions regarding content and objectives were also asked of the writer of the Language Arts curriculum. Here, too, the stated desire was to present Career Guidance students with experiences of "real" literature, not "kid stuff". However, it was pointed out by the interviewers that of the eight periods reserved for Language Arts, four must be devoted to corrective reading and one to speech. The

research team asked how it would be possible for chronic academic failures and retarded readers to manage regular 9th grade literature in but three periods per week. Although the curriculums were truly impressive in terms of scope, organization, clarity, and technical excellence, the question remained whether the content level was suitable for the pupils in this program.

What also seemed clear from study of the curriculums is that various writers had entirely different concepts of the Career Guidance student in mind. In contrast with the Science, Social Studies, and Language Arts writers who seemed to be gearing their product to capable and motivated youngsters who are but slightly different from regular junior high school students, other writers portrayed a deflated, defeated delinquent. For example, the Job Placement and Guidance curriculum described the Career Guidance youngster as follows:

> Lack of ambition; record of failure; poor records in personal and social adjustment; inadequate work and study habits; irregular school attendance; negative or hostile attitudes; product of broken homes; lonely and retiring; over-aggressive.

The writers of this particular curriculum think in terms of more modest academic growth and speak of "some measure of academic success". Indeed, the basic aim of the program is to equip these youngsters with low-level vocational skills, rather than seeking success through academic accomplishment.

> To help the pupils understand the dignity and importance of work and to learn how to adjust to their first job... Explaining the moral aspects of work and the responsibilities of workers... Orienting the pupils to the various aspects of the world of work... Helping the pupils in the selection of proper vocational training and/or selection of a job... For some of these pupils a part-time job is a good way to learn the discipline that the home, the school, and the community have been unable to teach them... The fact that a pupil can obtain and hold a job such as messenger boy, delivery boy or stock clerk, gives him an opportunity to experience success.

What is apparent from these divergent images of the Career Guidance student is the lack of agreement regarding objectives. It appears that each set of writers was free to develop his concept of Career Guidance and to plan a curriculum that would meet his particular concept of the pupils' needs. There was no evidence of a unified, integrated body of theory based on objective data regarding the students' realistic abilities, achievement, and aspirations. With each writer permitted to project his own image of the Career Guidance student, it is little wonder that objectives cover the range from early employment through college preparation. The research team felt that the difficult and exacting academic curriculums, such as Science and Social Studies, were most inappropriate and unrealistic for some of the pupils. The team found little to criticize in the less demanding vocational curriculums, such as Office Practice, Job Placement, and Industrial Arts.

Despite the inconsistencies in aims and difficulty levels, some of the new curriculums seem most promising. In a highly imaginative, well constructed approach to the problem of Career Guidance students, the Industrial Arts curriculum planned to build all of the academic skills around a shop core. The rationale was based on the supposed concrete and manipulative orientation of these students and the sheer time and space emphasis on Industrial Arts in Career Guidance. This curriculum indicated how all subject areas could be encompassed in one unified and integrated framework. For example, one of the major units is the maintenance and repair of bicycles. The curriculum sets forth suggestions for involving other subject areas: Mathematics lessons may be coordinated through use of the speedometer, estimating and computing; Social Studies may be coordinated through discussion and

study of factory methods, mass production, and source of materials; Science would introduce speed, balance, friction, and centrifugal force; and Language Arts could focus on reading road maps and writing safety slogans. A similar approach was outlined for each of the Industrial Arts units. For the subject of Operating Office Duplicating Machines, the following were suggested: Mathematics may include estimating cost of paper and supplies, cutting stock to dimension; Science would revolve about composition of metal, chemistry of ink, and process of photography; and Language Arts could take advantage of proof reading opportunities or reading job sheets.

Guidelines. Study of the completed curriculums generally support the series of recommendations that were incorporated in the early part of the report.

1. Since the Project was based on the plan of providing an appropriate curriculum for Career Guidance students, it is essential that research determine the nature and needs of these students. A beautifully written, accurate, and tightly organized curriculum seems to be in the making, but much of it may remain inappropriate if the students have neither the background nor the ability to assimilate the material.

2. It is necessary to build into the curriculum closer articulation both with elementary and secondary school programs. In order to restructure human beings continuous and ongoing programs and curriculums must be established from the earlier school level through the high school.

3. The approach with non-achievers requires a consideration of the students as individuals, and of flexible instructional treatments and provisions for adaptation to different ability levels. The Science curriculum, for example, contains more than 100 problems that must be covered in one year.

This program requires that topics such as Pressure and Sound be covered in less than two periods each.

4. One theme running through the literature of Career Guidance is the need for a therapeutic or ego enhancing school experience, that the curriculum must be a vehicle for ego growth. The research team felt that some parts of the curriculums in Social Science, Mathematics, and Science fall into precisely this category. These curriculums should be re-examined and modified to provide an opportunity for ego growth, and reduce the possibility for ego frustration.

5. The research team was generally in accord with the curriculum and instructional approaches for the disadvantaged that Savitsky proposed. In addition to his suggestions to personalize, to organize short, achievable units, and to build in elements of success, Savitsky stresses the need to orient disadvantaged students to job experience or the world of work:

> Occupational-mindedness is a dominant characteristic of these students. It is within the context of seeking a short-range, immediate goal --some vocational competence that bears hope and promise of erasing their disadvantaged state: it is their pragmatic test for judging the worth in subjects they are required to study. There is, therefore, more readiness to absorb instruction when identification or transfer is made to job preparation or improvement. This becomes especially meaningful and effective for students in supervised work-experience programs. Thus speech behavior in job interviews is woven into language arts; how we breathe and the production and transmission of sound are similarly part of this subject and are related to biology and science; protecting the worker is an assignment in social studies. (1)

---

(1) C. Savitsky. Reaching the Disadvantaged. In E. P. Torrance and R. D. Strom (Eds.) Mental Health and Achievement. N. Y.: John Wiley and Sons, 1965, p. 308. pp. 305-311.

What Savitsky proposed was part and parcel of the initial Career Guidance orientation. The purpose of part-time work was to integrate the world of work and academic skills. The Career Guidance administration has apparently found reason to alter this approach in some measure and to work toward returning Career Guidance students to the mainstream of academic competition. The research team feels that this decision may be unrealistic for large numbers of the target population. Work as the nucleus or core could permit teachers to operate as a team, to plan all academic experiences about this one area of assumed concern for each Career Guidance student. Work can carry motivational and concrete, meaningful, and ego-success elements. The single curriculum that maintains this orientation in a most sophisticated and creative manner is the Industrial Arts curriculum. The research team felt that such a work-centered and academic-shop integrated curriculum represents an appropriate and ego enhancing approach for Career Guidance students and should be expanded beyond present limits.

III Summary Conclusions and Recommendations

A. The Teacher Training Program

1. The evaluators questioned the timing of this project, which involved the training of teachers and supervisors at the end of the school year since some of them will not be involved in teaching Career Guidance classes in the following year. The investigators felt that such a training program given at the beginning of the school year would have been more effective.

2. The evaluation team was considerably less than enthusiastic about a teacher training program in the use of new curriculum materials that was not ready during said training.

3. Although the trainees were generally experienced people as a group, there were too many (especially in Mathematics) who were teaching in subject areas beyond their special preparation or license.

4. The value of the evaluation was unfortunately marred by the fact that questionnaires asking for reactions on the part of those trainees were answered by less than 40% of those enrolled.

5. The teachers entered the training program with high hopes and felt at the end of the training sessions that the program constituted good use of federal funds and that they and their pupils would benefit by the training they had received. The Assistant Principals involved in the training program, though not so optimistic as the teachers, felt that the program was worthwhile.

B The Development of New Curriculum Materials

1. The research team was fully aware of the positive and constructive aspects of the Career Guidance program in junior high schools, with its many noteworthy aspects: small classes, full time advisor for 45 pupils, separate classes for boys and girls, a separate shop with 8 periods of Industrial Arts, part-time work opportunities and special funds for materials.

2. Whatever the causes (the brief time --about a month-- alloted for the evaluation of the project made research in depth impossible which may be operating, the students in the Career Guidance program do not drop out at the end of the junior high school Career Guidance experience; more than 95% of them go on to 10th year instruction in academic and vocational high schools.

3. The greatest contribution of the Career Guidance program lies in the real growth and improvement of the pupils' self image and ego strength.

4. Some promising material was developed by the writers of the curriculum material. In Industrial Art it is recommended that all of the academic skills be centered around a shop core. The Social Studies Curriculum suggests coordination through the discussion of the factory methods. There are similar suggestions on the materials for use in Language Arts and Operating Office Duplication, Mathematics and Science.

5. Work centered and academic shop integrated courses represent an appropriate ego enhancing approach for Career Guidance students and should be expanded beyond present limits.

6. The curriculum writers, in their estimate of the ability of the teachers who were to use the new curriculum materials, seemed inflexible and insufficiently aware of variability, or teachers and pupils.

7. Teachers and supervisors were not widely involved in preparation of the new materials

8. The research team question whether the material developed was really "new" or mere extensions, modifications and revisions.

9. The writers of the curriculum materials did not have a consistent view of the needs of the pupils in Career Guidance classes, their aspirations and the course of their future education. There is evidence of confusion as to purpose -whether it is to prepare pupils with marketable skills in a vocation-oriented curriculum or to prepare them for continued education in academic and vocational schools.

10. The evaluators question the degree of success or academic achievement of pupils in the Career Guidance classes and consequent justification of returning pupils to regular classes in junior or senior high schools. In the small sampling made, pupils were reading below grade levels, and the degree of absence did not augur well for future academic success.

To summarize, though the investigators found many strengths in the Career Guidance program, they question whether the curriculum material developed in this federally funded curriculum writing project furthered the understanding of the needs of the pupils or provided the most appropriate or valuable assistance to the teachers of these special classes.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND TEACHER TRAINING FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN SPECIAL CLASSES (CAREER-GUIDANCE) IN REGULAR JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL.

Research Director:

Dr. Abraham Tannenbaum, Associate Professor of Education Teachers College, Columbia University

Research Staff:

Dr. Morris Gross, Assistant Professor of Education
Hunter College, the City University

Dr. Rita O' Hara, Assistant Professor of Education
Hunter College, the City University

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR CURRICULUM WRITERS

1. What do you think would be the most important outcomes of the Career Guidance Program?

   a. vocational skills
   b. social adjustment
   c. academic skills
   d. other

2. How were you selected for doing the curriculum for the Career Guidance Program?

   a. Did you work on the original curriculum 3 years ago? _____

   b. If not, how were you oriented to this work? _____

   c. Who oriented you to this work? _____

3. What is your background for this work?

   a. License(s) _____

   b. Years of experience _____

   c. Chief school experience _____

   d. Have you ever worked on the regular Board of Education curriculum? _____

   e. If so, which one (ones)? _____

4. How do you view the curriculum you're working on with the current Career Guidance curriculum?

   a. revision _____

   b. extension _____

   c. different in kind _____

   d. different in quality _____

   e. other _____

5. In terms of the curriculum you are now working on, where would you feel the main focus would be? Is every aspect of the curriculum specified with strong emphasis on planned lessons for the teacher or do you conceive of the new curriculum as providing guideposts which permit flexibility and innovation on the part of the teacher?

   What would your rationale be for this approach?

6. If you have knowledge of other curriculums, which one would Career Guidance most closely resemble?

   a. Vocational and Trade
   b. Business
   c. C.R.M.D.
   d. Academic H.S.
   e. Combination of
   f. Other

If there is a resemblance, how closely will it resemble any one of these (to your knowledge?)

7. Do you think this Career Guidance curriculum is:

   a. A simplified version of the regular Board of Education Curriculum?_____

   b. one with a completely different focus than the previous curriculum?_____

   _____

   c. a combination of both? _____

   _____

   d. a more vital version of the regular Board of Education curriculum?_____

   _____

   e. other?

8. Did you revise this curriculum on your own, or did you work with to get help from others?

   a. teachers

   b. administrators

   c. supervisors

   d. curriculum experts

   e. students

   f. the Board of Education

   If so, what kind of help

9. Will there be provision for variations in the curriculum used in the 8th and 9th grades? What will they be?

10. What provisions are you making for finding out the response to your curriculum?

11. Do you anticipate the need for any future revisions of the Career Guidance curriculum?

12. What difference has the Federal funds made in your developing this new Career Guidance curriculum?

    a. resources

    b. use of consultants

    c. processing of the curriculum materials

    d. improved working conditions

    e. clerical staff

    f. evaluation

    g. editorial work

    h. other

13. Would you have any suggestions as to how federal monies for curriculum development ought to be spent in the future?

14. How large a contribution to the success of the Career Guidance Program in the schools do you think curriculum has made?

Very Great	Moderate	Neutral	Minimal	None

Your curriculum in particular?

Very Great	Moderate	Neutral	Minimal	None

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION

EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAM FOR CAREER GUIDANCE PERSONNEL

This form has been prepared by the Center for Urban Education (C.U.E.) to help the New York City Board of Education evaluate the federally funded aspects of the Career Guidance Program. It is part of a larger scale assessment that will enable the Board to plan future expenditure of such funds on the basis of attitudes and recommendations expressed by Career Guidance Personnel throughout the city. In filling out this form you are invited to react to the Saturday morning in-service training session you have just attended. Use a separate form for each content area. Since there are two content areas covered every Saturday morning you are given two forms in order to be able to react separately to each area.

DIRECTIONS:

Part One: Fill in the following background information.

1. Your position in the New York City School system. (check one)

   Assistant principal_____; Teacher_____; Advisor_____

2. Number of years in the New York City School system. (check one)

   3 or less___; 4 - 10___; 11 - 20___; 21 or more_____

3. Sex (check one) Male_____; Female_____

4. Indicate N.Y.C. Board of Education license (s) you now hold:

   _____

5. Indicate subject (s) you have taught in the city system, and place an asterisk next to the one (s) you now teach.

   _____

   _____

6. Indicate the content area of the training session you are rating on this form.

   _____

   _____

   _____

Part Two: Rate each item as follows: Circle one using the following scale:

5 = Excellent (or high)
4 = Good
3 = Satisfactory (or moderate)
2 = Fair
1 = Poor (or low)
N = Not Applicable

1. Board of Education's decision to spend its federal funds on a June in-service training program rather than on another project....5 4 3 2 1 N

2. Board's decision to incorporate the present content area into the in-service training program..... 5 4 3 2 1 N

3. Degree to which you expected to benefit from this session before you entered it..... 5 4 3 2 1 N

4. Your overall rating of this session after it ended..... 5 4 3 2 1 N

5. Instructor's coverage of content..... 5 4 3 2 1 N

6. His organization of subject matter..... 5 4 3 2 1 N

7. Quality of his presentation..... 5 4 3 2 1 N

8. His mastery of the subject..... 5 4 3 2 1 N

9. Chances that the June in-service program will change the professional behavior of:

(answer all three)

Assistant Principals..... 5 4 3 2 1 N

Teachers..... 5 4 3 2 1 N

Advisors..... 5 4 3 2 1 N

10. Chances of Career Guidance pupils benefiting in September, 1966 from your experience in this session..... 5 4 3 2 1 N

Part Three: Write freely about any aspect of this session (or of the in-service program in general) that pleases and/or displeases you. Suggestions for improvement are also welcome.